



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,272	12/30/2003	Avinash Sodani	Intel 2207/17040	8519
7590 KENYON & KENYON Suite 600 333 W. San Carlos Street San Jose, CA 95110-2711		08/29/2007	EXAMINER COLEMAN, ERIC	
			ART UNIT 2183	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/749,272

Applicant(s)

SODANI ET AL.

Examiner

Eric Coleman

Art Unit

2183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 21 is directed to a set of instructions residing in a storage medium and capable of being executed by a processor to implement a method... However the storage medium is not limited to a computer readable storage medium and the instructions are not "stored" on a computer readable medium or "embodied" in a computer readable store medium and therefore is does not provide the instructions in a manner such that the instructions can be executed. Consequently the scope of invention include instructions that are not readable by a computer and therefore cannot be executed by an computer. Therefore the invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said rescheduling multiplexer" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Also claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and therefore contain that same antecedent basis problem.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 9-11, 17, 18, 21,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merchant et al. (patent No. 6,138,838) in view of Sager et al. (patent No. 6,256,745) and Hammarlund et al. (patent No. 6,912,648).

Merchant taught the invention substantially as claimed including a data processing ("DP") system comprising (as per claims 1,9):

a) Re-scheduler (72) coupled to an instruction queue (80,81,82,83) to receive an instruction (e.g., see fig. 3 and col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 10); and

b) Delay queue coupled to the output of the checker to hold the instruction (e.g., see fig. 3).

8. Merchant did not expressly detail (claims 1,9) that a delay unit coupled to a rescheduling unit multiplexer to store a wait history for the instruction. Sager however taught a latency vector input to a delay unit (delay line) for indicating the delay for the

instruction that was determined by decoding the instruction (e.g., see col. 14, lines 50-60 and col. 13, lines 55-67). Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to store the wait history or latency of the instruction within the multiplexer at least to maintain the value of the latency until the instruction was delayed for the determined delay time so that the multiplexer would work properly in delaying the instruction for the determined number of cycles. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the DP art to combine the teachings of Merchant and Sager. Both references were directed toward the problems of scheduling instructions in a DP system. And the outcome of coupling the rescheduling unit to the scheduler would have been predictable.

9. Merchant and Sager did not expressly detail (claims 1,9) that a delay queue to hold the instruction prior to the writing the instruction into a scheduler. Hammerlund et.al. however taught a delay queue (432,434,436,438) to hold the instruction prior to writing to the scheduler(402) (e.g., see fig. 4).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the DP art to combine the teachings of Merchant and Hammerlund. Both references were directed toward the problems of scheduling instructions in a DP system. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate Hammerlund teaching of plural delay queues to at least to facilitate implementing the different delays of instructions. Also the outcome of addition of the Hammerlund queue would have been predictable.

11. As to the further limitations of claim 9, Merchant taught a memory (122) and processor coupled to the memory and to execute the instructions and rescheduler

Art Unit: 2183

having a first input coupled to a instruction queue(80,81,82,83,) and a second input coupled to a replay unit (replay mux) and an output (e.g., see fig. 3).

12. As per claim 2,10, Hammerlund taught at least one delay line wherein each of the at least one delay line is to hold the instruction for a fixed number of clock cycles (e.g., see fig. 3 and col. 13, line 15-64).

13. As per claim 3, 11,Sager taught the re-scheduler device is to sort the instruction into at least one delay line based on the wait history of the instruction (e.g., see fig. 8 and col. 13, lines 33-67).

14. As per claim 17,21 Merchant taught receiving and instruction output from an instruction queue (80,81,82,83) to a checker (e.g., see fig. 3). And placing the instruction in a delay queue (85,84) (e.g., see fig. 3). Merchant did not specifically detail the delay unit scheduling history for the instruction and determining wait time for the instruction. Sager however taught this limitation (e.g., see fig. 8 and col. 13, line 55-col. 14, line 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Merchant and Sager. Both references were directed toward the problems of scheduling instructions in a DP system. And the outcome of coupling the rescheduling unit to the scheduler would have been predictable.

15. The incorporation of the delay unit scheduling history would provided predictable results. Merchant and Sager did not specifically detail writing the instruction to the scheduler after a fixed wait time. Hammerlund however taught this limitation (e.g., see fig. 3 and col. 13, lines 15-65). The incorporation of the writing of the instruction to a scheduler would have provided predictable results.

Art Unit: 2183

16. As per claim 18, 22 Merchant did not expressly detail determining a wait time for the instruction is based on the scheduling history stored in the delay unit (e.g., see fig. 8). Sager however taught a latency vector input to a delay unit (delay line) for indicating the delay for the instruction that was determined by decoding the instruction (e.g., see col. 14, lines 50-60 and col. 13, lines 55-67). Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to store the wait history or latency of the instruction within the multiplexer at least to maintain the value of the latency until the instruction was delayed for the determined delay time so that the multiplexer would work properly in delaying the instruction for the determined number of cycles. And the outcome of coupling the rescheduling unit to the scheduler would have been predictable.

17. Claims 4-5, and 7-8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merchant, Sager and Hammerlund as applied to claims 1-3, 9-11, 17, 18, 21, 22 above, and further in view of Grochowski (patent No. 6,035,389).

18. As per claim 4, 5, 12-13 Grochowski taught the delay unit is to store wait history or latency information for said instruction when said instruction is first scheduled, and is to update wait history information for the instruction when the instruction is executed (e.g., see fig. 5).

19. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to incorporate the Grochowski teachings of updating the latency or wait value at least to more accurately delay the

instructions in the scheduling of instructions that needed to be replayed. Also the incorporation of the updating of the latency would have provided predictable results.

20. As per claim 7,8,14,15,20,24 Grochowski taught the delay block utilizes a general prediction scheme to determine a number of clock cycles to store as the wait history and sorts instruction based on wait history or latency (e.g., see col. 3, lines 26-55 and col. 5, lines 8-32)[one general prediction scheme taught by Grochowski was to group instructions by type and predict that the instruction of a group have the same latency].

21. As per claim 16,19, 23, Sager taught the re-scheduler device is to sort the instruction into at least one delay line based on the wait history of the instruction (e.g., see fig. 8 and col. 13, lines 33-67).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Boggs (patent No. 6,877,086) disclosed system for rescheduling multiple micro-operations in a processor using a replay queue and a counter (e.g., see abstract).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Coleman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4163. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2183

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eric Coleman', with a stylized flourish at the end.

ERIC COLEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER